

Remarks

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the present U.S. Patent application as amended herein. Claims 29, 35 and 43 have been amended. Claims 1-28 have been canceled. No claims have been added. Thus, claims 29-60 are pending.

CLAIM REJECTIONS – 35 U.S.C. § 112, SECOND PARAGRAPH

Claims 2 and 35 were rejected as being indefinite. Claim 2 has been canceled and claim 35 has been amended to correct a typographical error. Therefore, Applicants request that the indefiniteness rejection be withdrawn.

CLAIM REJECTIONS – 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 1-5, 7, 15-19 and 57 were rejected as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,657,317 issued to Mahany (*Mahany*). Claims 1-5, 7 and 15-19 have been canceled. Therefore, the rejection of claims 1-5, 7 and 15-19 is moot. For at least the reasons set forth below, Applicants submit that claim 57 is not rendered obvious by *Mahany*.

Claim 57 recites:

a first hardware interface coupled with a primary processor system;
a sharing module coupled to the universal serial bus hardware interface, wherein the sharing module allows a GPRS communications module to be shared between the primary processor system and a secondary processor system; and
a second hardware interface coupled to the sharing module coupled with the secondary processor system.

Thus, Applicants claim multiple processing systems that share a GPRS communications module.

Mahany discloses multiple peripheral devices that wirelessly connect with a mobile computing device. Multiple mobile computing devices may communicate with a base station. See Figure 1c. However, nothing in *Mahany* teaches or suggests multiple processing systems that share a GPRS communications module. Therefore, *Mahany* cannot teach or suggest the invention as claimed in claim 57.

Claims 6, 8-13 and 20-27 were rejected as being unpatentable over *Mahany* in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,898,721 issued to Schmidt (*Schmidt*). Claims 6, 8-13 and 20-27 have been canceled. Therefore, the rejection of claims 6, 8-13 and 20-27 is moot.

Claims 29-33, 43-47, 49 and 54 were rejected as being unpatentable over *Mahany* in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,973,538 issued to Khawand (*Khawand*). For at least the reasons set forth below, Applicants submit that claims 29-33, 43-47, 49 and 54 are not rendered obvious by *Mahany* and *Khawand*.

Claim 29 recites:

sharing a GPRS communications module between a primary processor system that operates as a host system and a secondary processor system that can share control of the GPRS communications module with the primary processor system to allow the secondary processor system to utilize the GPRS communications module.

Thus, Applicants claim sharing control of a GPRS communications module between a host system and a secondary system. Claim 43 similarly recites sharing control of the GPRS communications module.

Applicants agree with the Office Action that *Mahany* does not disclose use of GPRS modules. The Office Action cites *Khawand* as using GPRS between nodes in a mobile system. However, *Khawand* does not disclose sharing control of a GPRS communications module between a host system and a secondary system. Therefore,

Mahany and *Khawnd*, alone or in combination, cannot teach or suggest the invention as claimed in claims 29 and 43.

Claims 30-33 depend from claim 29. Claims 44-47, 49 and 54 depend from claim 43. Because dependent claims include the limitations of the claims from which they depend, Applicants submit that claims 30-33, 44-47, 49 and 54 are not rendered obvious by *Mahany* and *Khawand* for at least the reasons set forth above.

Claims 34, 36-41, 48, 50-53 and 55 were rejected as being unpatentable over *Mahany* in view of *Khawand* and further in view of *Schmidt*. Each of claims 34, 36-41, 48, 50-53 and 55 depends, either directly or indirectly, from claims 29 and 43 discussed above. For at least the reasons set forth below, Applicants submit that claims 34, 36-41, 48, 50-53 and 55 are not rendered obvious by *Mahany*, *Khawand* and *Schmidt*.

As discussed above, no combination of *Mahany* and *Khawand* teaches or suggests sharing control of a GPRS module. *Schmidt* is cited to teach use of USB, Firewire, RS-232, etc. Whether or not this is an accurate characterization of *Schmidt*, nothing in *Schmidt* cures the deficiencies of *Mahany* and *Khawand* discussed above. Therefore, no combination of *Mahany*, *Khawand* and *Schmidt* can teach or suggest the invention as claimed in claims 34, 36-41, 48, 50-53 and 55.

Claim 58 was rejected as being unpatentable over *Mahany* in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0137472 of Quinn (*Quinn*). Claim 58 depends from claim 57 discussed above. For at least the reasons set forth below, Applicants submit that claim 58 is not rendered obvious by *Mahany* and *Quinn*.

Applicants agree with the Office Action that *Mahany* does not disclose a GPRS NDIS driver and a USB driver. *Quinn* is cited to teach a GPRS NDIS driver and a USB

driver. However, *Quinn* does not disclose sharing control of the GPRS module as recited in the claims. Because neither *Mahany* nor *Quinn* disclose or suggest sharing control of the GPRS module, no combination of *Mahany* and *Quinn* can teach or suggest the invention as claimed in claim 58.

Claims 14 and 28 were rejected as being unpatentable over *Mahany* in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0124196 of Morrow (*Morrow*). Claims 14 and 28 have been canceled. Therefore, the rejection of claims 14 and 28 is moot.

Claims 42 and 56 were rejected as being unpatentable over *Mahaney* in view of *Khawand* and further in view of *Morrow*. Claims 42 and 56 depend from claims 29 and 43 discussed above. For at least the reasons set forth below, Applicants submit that claims 42 and 56 are not rendered obvious by *Mahany*, *Khawand* and *Morrow*.

Morrow is cited to teach switching control upon occurrence of an event. However, *Morrow* does not cure the deficiencies of *Mahany* and *Khawand* set forth above. Therefore, no combination of *Mahaney*, *Khawand* and *Morrow* can teach or suggest the invention as claimed in claims 42 and 56.

Claim 59 was rejected as being unpatentable over *Mahany* in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0200315 of Goldenberg (*Goldenberg*). Claim 59 depends from claim 57 discussed above. For at least the reasons set forth below, Applicants submit that claim 58 is not rendered obvious by *Mahany* and *Goldenberg*.

Applicants agree with the Office Action that *Mahany* does not disclose a USB function driver that includes a protocol translator to translate between RNDIS and NDIS. *Goldenberg* is cited to teach a USB function driver that includes a protocol translator to translate between RNDIS and NDIS. However, *Goldenberg* does not disclose sharing

control of the GPRS module as recited in the claims. Because neither *Mahany* nor *Goldenberg* disclose or suggest sharing control of the GPRS module, no combination of *Mahany* and *Goldenberg* can teach or suggest the invention as claimed in claim 59.

CONCLUSION

For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicants submit that the rejections have been overcome. Therefore, claims 29-60 are in condition for allowance and such action is earnestly solicited. The Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned by telephone if such contact would further the examination of the present application. Please charge any shortages and credit any overcharges to our Deposit Account number 02-2666.

Respectfully submitted,
BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN, LLP

Date: August 1, 2007

/Paul A. Mendonsa/
Paul A. Mendonsa
Attorney for Applicant
Reg. No. 42,879

12400 Wilshire Boulevard
Seventh Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90025-1026
(503) 439-8778